

**Home Visiting Task Force
Sustainability Workgroup Meeting
December 19th, 2013**

Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Sam Aigner-Treaworgy, Nancie Brown, Paula Corrigan-Halpern, Liz Heneks, Teresa Kelly, David Lloyd, Andrea Palmer, Chelsea Pearsall, Anna Potere, Mike Shaver, Nancy Shier, Joanna Su, Ashley Williams, Jay Young

- I. **November 14th Meeting Minutes:** The November meeting minutes were passed with one edit, which was made before posting the minutes.
- II. **Update on Medicaid Financing for Home Visiting**
 - a. Reflections from Medicaid Provider Meetings:
 - i. There was consistent support and enthusiasm for Medicaid as a funding strategy for home visiting programs.
 - ii. The groups explored whether there are other sets of activities consistent across models where there is revenue to be captured. One thing they want all of us to keep in mind is that Medicaid is an administratively intensive activity, e.g. compliance, infrastructure, which is comparable to private insurance in terms of clerical and administrative approaches. For this reason, we need to make sure that some of the revenue generated goes towards supporting administrative/overhead components/activities, which will help the State avoid liabilities.
 - iii. The question that remains unanswered is how much revenue this funding strategy would have to generate to make it worthwhile for agencies to do this type of billing after accommodating the overhead/administrative costs. We have always talked about this being a voluntary option for programs and that we should begin with programs already billing Medicaid for other activities since they have some experience.
 - iv. We also need to be cognizant of the impact of the State's transition to managed care.
 - b. 1115 Waiver Update:
 - i. We have heard from multiple sources that home visiting will be on the list of services that the State will include in its waiver application to the federal government.
 - ii. The State is closely following the progress of New York and Oregon, who are also applying for this waiver.
 - iii. We need some more information on:
 1. How the funding will be distributed, e.g. do we only get the funding once, is it similar to a block grant, etc.
 2. The expectations for the architecture of the waiver, e.g. is it HFS's view that we need a lockbox to protect the revenue generated by the waiver?
 - c. Meeting with HFS Director Hamos: we have a meeting scheduled with Director Hamos on January 6th, and will debrief at our January Sustainability Workgroup meeting.
- III. **Home Visiting Funding Opportunities with Foundations**
 - a. Sara Slaughter from the McCormick Foundation asked what would be possible to fund with smaller grants, e.g. around \$50k, and expressed an interest in pursuing funding coordinated intake in voluntary communities.
 - b. Children's Healthcare Foundation in Oak Brook has an interest in mental health and an interest in funding direct services.
 - c. Pay for Success Financing:

- i. Ready Nation is hosting a conference, sponsored by the Pritzker Foundation, to provide state teams with technical assistance on pay for success financing. The Ounce put together a team from Illinois to focus on home visiting and our application was accepted, so the team will be attending the conference in March and will share what we learn.
 - ii. The Department of the Treasury issued a request for information on pay for success financing. The Ounce responded, making the case that the federal government should consider home visiting as a pay for success financing strategy.
 - iii. Monetization of short-term benefits is important. There are some conceptual gaps between economic modeling for this and what data is available.
- d. Next Steps:
 - i. Identify the new CEO of the Children's Healthcare Foundation in Oak Brook.
 - ii. Share the Ounce's response to the federal RFI on Pay for Success financing.

IV. **Home Visiting Data Project**

- a. The Home Visiting Task Force is partnering with the Data, Research and Evaluation committee of the Early Learning Council in order to identify the essential data metrics that all home visiting funding agencies should collect from their programs.
- b. We need to ensure that we have the capacity to process the data that exists. Potentially this is something that could be funded through a private foundation, e.g. McCormick.
- c. Next Steps:
 - i. Anna and Angela, the DRE staffer, will send out an email to ask people to participate on the joint ad hoc workgroup. They will make sure that representatives from key agencies and data projects will be included.
 - ii. Teresa will share the completed MIEHV benchmark reports.

V. **Blending and Braiding Roundtables**

- a. The Blending, Braiding and Sustainable Funding subcommittee hosted 5 roundtables around the state targeted towards program level of all types. They asked participants for:
 - i. feedback on the barriers to blending and braiding funding to be able to invest in services;
 - ii. state-level investments that should be made in order to support the CQI process; and
 - iii. how funding should be spent and what gaps in services currently exist.
- b. Initial results across roundtables:
 - i. Programs do not feel that funding structures set them up to collaborate with each other; instead, they have to compete for a limited pool of funding. The solution could be investing in community-level supports.
 - ii. Common gaps are staff development and support, and increased administrative burden without additional supports. This is where blending and braiding overlapped most with home visiting, i.e. the administrative burden is reduced in times when they are blending with center-based.
 - iii. Lessons learned from MIECHV, especially coordinated intake, are important in reviewing the recommendations.
- c. The ultimate goal for the final recommendation is to connect with other groups doing cross-work to figure out how to do implement their findings across initiatives.

VI. **Next meeting: January 13th, 2014.**